

U.S. Serial No. 10/714,790  
Response to Office Action mailed October 19, 2004

Page 7 of 9

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 19, 2004 finally rejecting claims 1-4, 7-10, 12, 13, 16, 20, and 21 has been reviewed, along with the prior art referenced against the claims. In response, selected claims have been amended in an effort to advance prosecution of the application. Arguments in support of patentability are also presented below and, when considered objectively, are deemed to place the application in condition for allowance.

With regard to the specification, applicants have now inserted the status of the prior application as "now abandoned."

With regard to the objection to claims 1 and 10, applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. The sixth paragraph of Section 112 of the Patent Statute is intended to provide an alternative manner of claiming, namely, expressing an element of a combination claim as a means or step for performing a specified function. The indication that it is "without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof" does not preclude such a recitation, rather it is provided as an alternative to the typical recitation of structure, material, or acts in support thereof. It is respectfully asserted that the Examiner is improperly construing Section 112, paragraph 6.

As noted above, claim amendments have been made in an effort to advance prosecution. This change should not be construed as any acquiescence to the Examiner's position regarding Section 112, paragraph 6, which is believed to be improper. On the other hand, the Examiner must also consider the functional recitation associated with the totally reflecting coating. To ignore the functional limitation would place applicant in the undesired position of emphasizing the function through use of a means-plus-function recitation and not be able to refer to such structure if the Examiner's objection is upheld, or referring to the structure and ignoring the functional limitation – a lose/lose proposition for applicant.

Claim stand rejected on the basis of Bockley, et al. – U.S. Patent No. 5,660,462 ("Bockley") as modified by Kosmatka, et al. – U.S. Patent No. 5,506,471

U.S. Serial No. 10/714,790  
Response to Office Action mailed October 19, 2004

Page 8 of 9

("Kosmatka") and Arlt, et al. – U.S. Patent No. 5,017,839 ("Arlt"). The Examiner recognizes that Bockley only provides a reflective coating 222 on one end of the double ended lamp. It must be appreciated that the reason for such a coating to reflect visible and infrared radiation is a result of the environment in which the lamp is used, namely, a headlight. Without the reflective coating, the lamp assembly encounters an issue with regard to glare. Thus, even though it is recognized that operating efficiency may be increased, the teachings associated with Bockley are to limit the reflective coating to one end (compare the various embodiments of Bockley, which all provide a coating on one end of the lamp only).

Applicants do not dispute the reliance on Kosmatka for teaching an interference coating having alternate layers of high and low refractive indices. However, the reliance on Arlt for coatings 7 and 8 at the end regions of the envelope is respectfully traversed. The claims of the present application require a totally reflecting coating. Such is not the case with Arlt which teaches a silicon iron oxide coating that is more akin to a white coating and is not highly reflective like the silver or aluminum of a totally reflecting coating. Moreover, in light of the express teaching in Bockley that a totally reflective coating be provided on one end only, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to incorporate the selected teaching of Arlt to satisfy these claim limitations. Thus, claims 1 and 10, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, each require a totally reflecting coating, and moreover require such coating be disposed on the opposite ends of the envelop. To reach the conclusion of the propriety of combining these disparate references requires the Examiner to improperly use applicant's own teachings in a hindsight manner.

No issues are raised requiring further search or consideration. Rather, the claim amendments are made solely to respond to the Examiner's issues (even though

U.S. Serial No. 10/714,790  
Response to Office Action mailed October 19, 2004

Page 9 of 9

not agreed with) and to advance this application to allowance. Accordingly, entry of the amendment, and an indication of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy E. Nauman

Reg. No. 32,283  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518  
(216) 861-5582